

श्री विजयीन्द्रतीर्थविरचिता
न्यायाध्वदीपिका
श्री अप्पय्यदीक्षितविरचितः
उपक्रमपराक्रमः
श्री विजयीन्द्रतीर्थविरचितः
उपसंहारविजयः
श्री व्यासतीर्थविरचित
तर्कताण्डवे उपक्रमपराक्रमभङ्गः
श्री शङ्करभट्टविरचितः
मीमांसासारसङ्ग्रहः

Edited by
Mahāmahopādhyāya
Prof. K.T. Pandurangi

2004

Published by
Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation
Bangalore-4.

श्री विजयीन्द्रतीर्थविरचिता न्यायाध्वदीपिका
श्री अप्पय्यदीक्षितविरचितः उपक्रमपराक्रमः
श्री विजयीन्द्रतीर्थविरचितः उपसंहारविजयः
श्री व्यासतीर्थविरचित तर्कताण्डवे उपक्रमपराक्रमभङ्गः
श्री शङ्करभट्टविरचितः मीमांसासारसङ्ग्रहः

Edited by
Rashtrapati Prashasti Puraskrita
Mahāmahopādhyāya
Prof. K.T. Pandurangi
*Formerly Prof. of Sanskrit, Bangalore University
Hon. Director of Dvaita Vedanta Studies
and Research Foundation, B'lore.*

2004

This volume is published with the grant from the Govt. of India, Ministry of Human Resources Development, Dept. of Education under the central plan scheme - Development of Sanskrit Education.



Published by
Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation
No.11, Uttaradi Matha Compound, Basavanagudi,
Bangalore-4.

Nyāyādhvadīpikā of Śrī Vijayindra tirtha, **Upakramaparākrama** of Śrī Appayya Dixita, **Upasamhāra Vijaya** of Śrī Vijayindra tirtha, **Upakrama Parākramabhanga** in Tarkatāṇḍava of Śrī Vyāsātirtha, **Mīmāṃsāsāra saṅgraha** of Śrī Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa. Edited by Prof. K.T. Pandurāṅgi, Published by Dvaita Vedānta Studies and Research Foundation, No.11, Uttaradi Matha Compound, Basavanagudi, Bangalore-04. Phone : 080-2662 7272

No. of Pages : xlv + 318

No. of Copies : 500

Year 2004

Price : Rs. 100/-

© The Editor

Copies can be had from :

Dvaita Vedānta Studies and Research Foundation,
No.11, Uttaradi Matha Compound,
Basavanagudi, Bangalore-560 004.
Phone : 080-2662 7272



Typeset and Printed at : Vāgartha

No.149, 8th Cross, N.R. Colony, Bangalore-560 019.
Ph.: 2242 7677

Preface

In this volume three very useful texts of Pūrvamīmāṃsa are included.

Nyāyadhvadīpikā of Śrī Vijayīndra tīrtha briefly mentions all the topics presented in the Jaiminī Sūtra of Pūrvamīmāṃsa. It is not mere listing of these topics. It is a critical presentation pointing out the link and the purpose served by each topic. Apparent conflicts are also reconciled. Clarity and precision are its merits.

Upakrama Parākrama by Śrī Appayya Dikṣita argues the preferability of Upakrama to Upasamhāra. He profusely quotes from Pūrvamīmāṃsa sources in support of his theses.

Upasamhāra Vijaya of Śrī Vijayīndra tīrtha refutes Appayya Dikṣita's claim and affirms the preferability of Upasamhāra to Upakrama, he peruses through the jungle of Pūrvamīmāṃsa references given by Appayya Dikṣita.

The source of this problem is Tarkatāṇḍava. Hence, we thought that inclusion of the relevant portion from Tarkatāṇḍava will give a clear picture of this problem.

A small text of Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa viz. Mīmāṃsā Nyāya Saṅgraha is also included in this volume for the ready reference of Mīmāṃsa Nyāyas.

We thank Raja Giryacharya and Raja Pavamanacharya for providing the manuscripts of Nyāyadhvadīpikā and Upasamhāra Vijaya.

We also thank Vidwan Sheshachala Sharma for reading the proof. It is difficult to correctly read the old manuscripts. Vidwan Sheshachala Sharma gave valuable suggestion in this respect.

N. Narasimha Rau

Chairman

D.V.S. & R.F., B'lore.

Introduction

न्यायाद्वदीपिका

1) Nyāyadhvadīpikā of Śrī Vijayindra tīrtha is a manual of Pūrvamīmāṃsā. It gives a brief account of all the topics in the entire Jaiminī Sūtras and Śābara bhāṣya. First a broad conspectus of the topics of chapters and sections is given. The Jaiminī sūtras are arranged in twelve chapters, sixty sections and a thousand topics. Nyāyadhvadīpikā states these in the same order. In addition, the procedural grounds and the grounds for particular sequence are stated. It is not a mechanical narration. It gives the perspective and the purpose of each topic and the sequence. It is technically known as सङ्गति. In each section, after presenting the topic of the section, certain exceptions to the ruling given in the section are stated. The conflicts, if any, are resolved, गतार्थताशङ्का is answered. References of adhikaraṇas for all these points are given. In a way it is a critical presentation of the topics of entire Pūrvamīmāṃsā. It is not mere enumeration of the topics. Keeping this scheme and purpose in mind a brief account of the discussion of the topics in this manual is given below.

2) Topics of the Chapters

Chapter I विध्यर्थवादमन्त्रनामधेयात्मककृत्स्नस्य वेदस्य प्रामाण्यं निरूपितम्

Chapter II यजति ददाति जुहोति कर्मणां भेदो निरूपितः

Chapter III प्रयाजादीनां दर्शपूर्णमासार्थत्वेन तत्शेषत्वं निरूपितम्

Chapter IV गोदोहनस्य पुरुषार्थप्रयुक्ततया अनुष्ठानं नतु
क्रत्वर्थप्रयुक्ततया इत्येवमादयो विषयाः निरूपिताः

Chapter V क्रमनियतिविधेयत्वादयः

Chapter VI कर्तुः अधिकारः

Chapter VII सामान्यतो अतिदेशः

Chapter VIII विशेषतः अतिदेशः

Chapter IX ऊहः

Chapter X बाधः

Chapter XI तन्त्रम्—आवपः

Chapter XII प्रसङ्गः

After stating the topics of the chapters, the topics of each section of a chapter are stated in a systematic way.

3) In the third chapter अङ्गत्वबोधकप्रमाणs viz. श्रुतिलिङ्ग-वाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यां are stated in detail. The nature of each of these प्रमाणs is explained with suitable examples.

It is also stated that among these later is inferior to the earlier as per the सूत्र— श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणानां समवाये पादौर्बल्यमर्थं विप्रकर्षात् ।

Nyāyadhvadipikā gives instances of earlier criterion prevailing over the later criterion in all these cases. This

is the normal procedure. However, there are some exceptions to it.

श्रुत्यादीनां विरोधे पारदौर्बल्यं दर्शितम् । एतदपवादोपि तत्र तत्र दृश्यते ।

For instance, the श्रुति सुवेण अवद्यति conveys the अङ्गत्व of सुव to the अवदान of पुरोडाश etc. all हविर्द्रव्य but it has सामर्थ्य for the अवदान of only द्रव्यद्रव्य. Hence it is considered as अङ्ग of only द्रव्यद्रव्यावदान. This is a case of the criterion of लिङ्ग prevailing over श्रुति. Similarly the श्रुति 'भिन्ने जुहोति' prescribes होम when the sacrificial vessel is broken. However, the scope of this श्रुति has to be restricted to दर्शपूर्णमासगतपात्र only by प्रकरण. This is an instance of प्रकरण prevailing over श्रुति. Nyāyadvadīpikā gives instances of such exception in respect of all six criterion.

4) After discussing श्रुति etc. six अङ्गत्वबोधक प्रमाणs, their प्राबल्यदौर्बल्य and the exception to these, Nyāyadvadīpikā proceeds to discuss six क्रमप्रमाणs.

श्रुत्यर्थादिप्रमाणानां स्वरूपं विषयांस्तथा
तेषां प्राबल्यदौर्बल्ये संक्षिप्यैव निरूप्यते ।

श्रुति-अर्थ-पाठ-स्थान-मुख्य-प्रवृत्ति are the six criteria utilised to determine the क्रम i.e. order of the items to be observed in a sacrificial programme. Nyāyadvadīpikā explains these giving the instances. We may notice three instances to have an idea of the method of presentation of these.

- i) श्रुतिक्रम-अध्वर्युः गृहपतिं दीक्षयित्वा ब्रह्माणं दीक्षयति तत उद्गातारं ततो होतारं ततः प्रतिप्रस्थातरम् ।

Here the order of दीक्षा is stated by श्रुति. Hence, it has to be followed as per श्रुति.

- ii) अर्थक्रम - The word अर्थ means purpose. The order based on the purpose served is अर्थक्रम.
यवाग्वा अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति, यवागूं पचति.

Here unless येवागूपाक is made यवागूहोम cannot be made. Hence, यवागूपाक be made earlier to होम, though it is stated later.

- iii) प्रवृत्तिक्रम The order based on the first action.
For instance for सप्तदश वाजपेयपशु, उपाकरण, नियोजन etc धर्म are prescribed. The order in which these are to be observed is not stated.

Hence, one can start with any item for the first पशु. This is प्रवृत्ति. But for other पशुs he should follow the same order of observing धर्म as done for the first पशु. This is प्रवृत्तिक्रम.

Instances for other criteria of order are also explained in detail. The प्राबल्यदौर्बल्य of these is stated with suitable instances.

5) After discussing the guideline of क्रम. Nyāyadhva dipikā states an important point viz. The types of injunctions developed in chapter second to sixth.

- ii) द्वितीये उत्पत्तिविधिप्रमेयस्य कर्मभेदस्य
- iii) तृतीये विनियोगविधिप्रमेयस्य शेषशेषिभावस्य
- iv-v) चतुर्थपञ्चमयोः प्रयोगविधिप्रमेययोः प्रयुक्तिक्रमयोः
- vi) षष्ठे अधिकारविधिप्रमेयः फलसम्बन्धः निरूपितः ।

6) In respect of अधिकार the following points have to be noted :

- i) Woman i.e. यजमानपत्नी has adhikara jointly with यजमान.
- ii) In सत्रयाग where all priests are यजमानs, each gets full फल of the याग.
- iii) There is no प्रतिनिधि for अधिकारि, देवता and अग्नि. There is प्रतिनिधि only for द्रव्य.
- iv) The सर्वस्वदक्षिणा does not include father etc.
- v) रथकार and निषादस्थपति are eligible for the sacrifice prescribed for them.

7) After presenting the themes of first six chapters, Nyāyadhvadīpikā proceeds to discuss Atideśa stated in seventh and eighth chapters. In the seventh chapter the instances of सामान्यातिदेश and in the eighth chapter the instances of विशेषातिदेश are given. Some special points of these are particularly discussed. अतिदेश is based on वचन etc.

वचन नामधेय चोदनालिङ्ग भेदेन त्रिविधः ।

8) In the ninth chapter ऊह is discussed.

अतिदिष्टानां मन्त्रसामसंस्काराणां प्राकृतपदार्थकार्यापन्न वैकृतपदार्थान्तर सम्बन्धेन अन्यथा भावस्वरूपः ऊहः नवमे चिन्तितः ।

9) In the tenth chapter बाध is discussed.

एवमातिदेशिकपदार्थगतस्वरूपान्तरात्मकोहनिरूपणानन्तरं तन्निवृत्त्या-
त्मको बाधो दशमाध्याये निरूपितः ।

Normally बाध is worked out on three grounds viz. अर्थलोप, द्वारलोप and प्रत्याम्नान. But Nyāyadhvadipikā states several other grounds such as :

श्रुत्या स्मृतिबाधः । प्रबलपदार्थेन दुर्बलक्रमबाधः, परेण पूर्वस्य बाधः, मुख्येन गौणस्य बाधः, मन्त्रक्रमेण ब्राह्मण क्रमस्य बाधः and so on.

The three types of बाध mentioned earlier are applicable only in respect बाध of प्रकृति items in विकृति. However, the concept of बाध has much wider application. Keeping this fact in view Nyāyadhvadipikā has worked out the above types of बाध.

10) In the eleventh chapter तन्त्र and आवाप are discussed. तन्त्र is three types viz. फलतन्त्र, पदार्थतन्त्र and अनुष्ठान तन्त्र.

- i) दर्शपूर्णमास consist of आग्नेय etc. six यागs. However स्वर्गरूपफल is one for all these. This is फलतन्त्र.
- ii) देश, काल and कर्ता prescribed for दर्शपूर्णमास are common. Hence, this is an instance of पदार्थतन्त्र.
- iii) At ज्योतिष्टोम with reference to पशु of अग्नीषोमीय,

सवनीय and अनुबन्ध्य 'दीक्षासु यूपं छिनत्तीति' विहितः यूपः अनुष्ठानतन्त्रम् ।

11) आवाप is separate observation of अङ्ग for each item. This has to be done when देश, काल and कर्ता are different.

यत्र तु देशकालकर्तृणां भेदः तत्र न तन्त्रम् ।

- i) राजसूये अनुमत्यादयः इष्टयः तत्र देशभेदः ।
- ii) बार्हस्पत्यं चरुं, निर्वपति ब्राह्मणे गृहे ऐन्द्रमेकादशकपालं राजन्यस्य गृहे इति दर्शादित्रिककालभेदः ।
- iii) वरुणप्रघासे कर्तृभेदः ।

12) In the twelvth chapter प्रसङ्ग is discussed. An item that is observed for the sake of one. Serving the other also is प्रसङ्ग ।

अन्यार्थेनान्यस्य तत्प्रयुक्तिशक्तस्योपकारः । This प्रसङ्ग is of three types i) अनुष्ठानप्रसङ्ग ii) पदार्थप्रसङ्ग iii) शास्त्रप्रसङ्ग.

- i) पश्वर्थप्रयाजाद्यनुष्ठानेन पशुपुरोडाशाद्युपकारः अनुष्ठानप्रसङ्गः ।
- ii) सौमिकया वेद्या सोमान्तर्गतेष्टिपशूनामुपकारः पदार्थप्रसङ्गः ।
- iii) यजनादिभिः ब्राह्मणो धनमार्जयेदिति द्रव्यार्जनशास्त्रेण ज्योतिष्टोमादिशास्त्रस्य त्रैवर्णिकनामार्तिज्यमाक्षेपुं प्रवृत्तस्य उपकारः शास्त्रप्रसङ्गः ।

The above brief summary of Nyāyadhvadīpikā will reveal the following points.

- i) A brief summary the topics discussed in twelve chapters is given.
- ii) Each topic is critically examined.
- iii) Exceptions are noted.
- iv) Aparent conflicts are resolved.

This manual though small gives deeper insight into Mimāṃsā thought.

उपक्रमपराक्रमः – उपसंहारविजयः

1) Upakrama Parākrama is a work of Sri Appayya Dikṣita a wellknown scholar of Advaita Vedānta and Pūrvamīmāṃsā. In this work he upholds the preferability of the statement at the commencement of a discourse (उपक्रम) to that of a statement at the close (उपसंहार). When there is a conflict between the two Upakrama statement be taken in its मुख्यार्थ i.e. primary meaning, and the Upasamhāra statement in गौणार्थ and the two statements be reconciled.

2) This view is supported by two instances viz. वेदोपक्रमाधिकरण and अश्वप्रतिग्रहेष्ट्यधिकरण.

In उपक्रमाधिकरण it is stated at the commencement त्रयो वेदा अजायन्त । अग्नेः ऋग्वेदः वायोर्यजुर्वेदः आदित्यात् सामवेदः at the close it is found that उच्चैः ऋचा क्रियते उपांशु यजुषा उच्चैः साम्ना. Here the question arises whether उच्चैष्टव etc are enjoined with reference to individual ऋक्, यजुस् and सामन् or with reference to ऋग्वेद, यजुर्वेद and सामवेद. In the former case उच्चैष्टव etc have to be observed with reference individual ऋक् etc. wherever these occur, and in the latter case these have to be observed only in respective वेद. Here is a conflict between उपक्रम and उपसंहार statements.

This is solved by preferring उपक्रम statement that refers to वेद and taking the words ऋक् etc in the उपसंहार

statement also in the sense ऋग्वेद etc. by लक्षणा. The main ground for preferring the उपक्रम statement is that at that stage there is no conflict as the उपसंहार position is not yet presented. This is technically known as असंजात विरोध.

3) After stating the preferability of उपक्रम, Upakrama Parākrama quotes the view of those who hold the view that उपसंहार is preferable. उपक्रम which occurs first needs explanation when there is conflict. Therefore it is व्याख्येय while उपसंहार is व्याख्यान. व्याख्येय has to be comprehended in the light of व्याख्यान.

अत्र केचिदवाचीनाः कल्पयन्ति । उपक्रमादुपसंहारो बलीयान् । तद्व्याख्यानरूपत्वात् । एकस्मिन् वाक्ये प्रथमभागे कचिदर्थे धीस्थे चरमभागस्य तद्विरोधिनो अवैयर्थ्याय तद्व्याख्यानरूपत्वं कल्पनीयम् । व्याख्यानस्य पाश्चात्यत्व नियमात् लोके गामानय बलीवर्दमानय इत्यादौ तथा दर्शनात् । वेदेपि उग्रं वचो अपावधीमित्यादिमन्त्राणां अशुनाया पिपासे हवा उग्रं वचा इत्यादि व्याख्यानरूप ब्राह्मणानुसारेण अर्थाङ्गीकरात् ।

यत्तु अनुपजात विरोधित्वात् प्राबल्यमुक्तं तत्र सर्वत्र आपातप्रत्ययस्यैव प्राबल्यप्रसङ्गेन विमर्शवैयर्थ्यापत्तेः । अतो नोपक्रमस्य प्राबल्यं युक्तम् ।

4) After presenting the view of उपसंहार प्राबल्यवादिन्, Upakrama Parākrama argues that प्रथमश्रुत i.e. उपक्रमश्रुत also can be व्याख्यान and चरमश्रुत i.e. उपसंहारश्रुत can be व्याख्येय.

प्रथमश्रुतस्यैव चरमश्रुतव्याख्यानत्वं कल्पनीयम् । लोके पुङ्गवं पश्य देवनाय अक्षमानय इत्यादौ प्रथमश्रुतस्यापि चरमश्रुत व्याख्यानत्वदर्शनात् ।

व्याकरणे वृद्धिरादैच् इत्यादेः स्विचि वृद्धिरित्यादिचरमश्रुतसूत्रस्थ वृद्ध्यादिपदव्याख्यानरूपत्वात् । तस्मात् परस्परविरोधस्थले परस्पर व्याख्यानरूपत्वकल्पनमप्रमाणम् ।

5) This contention of Upakrama Parākrama is rejected by उपसंहारविजय of Śrī Vijayindra tirtha. Unless व्याख्येय is available व्याख्यान cannot take place. Hence that which occurs first i.e. उपक्रम, has to be taken as व्याख्येय.

अत्र ब्रूमः व्याख्येयोपस्थितिं विना व्याख्यान प्रसक्तिरेव नेत्यविवादम् । तत्र उपक्रम एव व्याख्येयत्वेन स्वीकार्यः । विहिताध्ययनदशायां तस्यैव प्रथमोपस्थितत्वात् ।

‘देवनाय अक्षमानय । वृद्धिरादैच् इत्यादौच व्याख्यातुः व्याख्येय अक्षवृद्ध्यादि शब्दोपस्थितिप्राथम्य सत्वात् ।

ii) एवं वेदेपि यतो वेत्यादौ यत्र दुःखेन सम्भिन्नमित्यादौ व्याख्यातुः वेदस्य व्याख्येयब्रह्मस्वर्गादि पदोपस्थितेः पाठक्रमेण अप्राथम्येपि अर्थक्रमानुसारेण प्राथम्यमस्ति ।

6) Upakrama Parākrama quotes अक्ताधिकरण as supporting उपसंहारप्राबल्य and rejects it. In अक्ताधिकरण the statement ‘अक्ताः शर्कराः उपदधाति’ occurs in the injunction at the commencement. This means anointment may be made by any oil. However, in वाक्यशेष it is stated that तेजो वै घृतम्. By this the scope of the general statement is restricted to the anointing by ghee. This is a case of उपसंहारप्राबल्य.

7) Upakrama Parākrama quotes पशुचोदनाधिकरण as supporting उपसंहारप्राबल्य and rejects it.

The injunction अग्नीषोमीयं पशुमालभेत enjoins offering पशु without specifying any particular पशु. But in the मन्त्र छागस्य वपाया मेदसो अनुब्रूहि. छाग is specified. This is another instance of उपसंहार प्राबल्य.

तद्व्यपदेशधिकरण and जातेष्ट्याधिकरण are also quoted in support of उपसंहारप्राबल्य.

8) Stating 'उपसंहारप्राबल्यवादिन्s' view Upakrama Parākrama argues that in these instances उपसंहार only provides the particular requirement. It does not totally reject the statement of उपक्रम.

- i) उपक्रमापेक्षितविशेषसमर्पक एवात्रोपसंहारो न तु तद्वाधकः ।
(नयविवेक)
- ii) यो वाक्यस्य सामान्येन उपक्रमः स निगमनवशेन विशेषे पर्यवसिता (न्यायसुधा)
- iii) अक्ताधिकरणे अवश्यं यः कश्चित् विशेषः उपादातव्यः । अस्ति तत्र धृतस्य प्रमाणं वाक्यशेषः ।

9) In the injunction 'यो दीक्षितो अग्नेषोमीयं पशुमालभेत्' । The word पशु is not taken in the sense of छाग because of उपसंहारप्राबल्य. मन्त्र is not of the nature of उपसंहार.

किञ्च विधेः मन्त्रानुसारेण पर्यवसानाभ्युगमेपि न ततः उपसंहार-

प्राबल्यम् । मन्त्रस्य विध्युपसंहाराभावात् । एक वाक्यतया पूर्वपरभावेन आम्रातयोरेव पूर्वापरभावः ।

10) उपसंहारविजय points out that these are not merely instances of सामान्यविशेष but these are the cases of सन्दिग्धार्थ उपक्रम to be resolved by उपसंहार.

i) अस्ति च उपक्रमस्य सन्दिग्धार्थत्वम् । 'अक्ताः शर्कराः उपदधाति' 'वासः परिधत्ते' इत्यादावपि सामान्यरूपेण अक्षिप्त-द्रवद्रव्यशब्दस्य वासशब्दस्य च सन्दिग्धार्थत्वं स्फुटम् ।

ii) एवमग्रीषोमीयं पशुमित्यत्रापि सन्दिग्धार्थत्वं ज्ञेयम् ।

11) Upakrama Parākrama quotes the view of उपसंहार प्राबल्य वादिन् that परत्व i.e. occurrence of later is the ground of उपसंहारप्राबल्य. In this respect अपच्छेदाधिकरणन्याय is utilised. In अपच्छेदाधिकरण it is stated that at ज्योतिष्टोम.

प्रतिहर्ता उद्गाता प्रस्तोता and अध्वर्यु are required to move holding the end of the cloth of each in that order. In this process if from उद्गाता's hand the cloth slips, then the sacrifice should be completed without giving any dakshina. If it slips from the hand of प्रतिहर्ता, सर्वस्वदक्षिणा be given. When the slip takes place one after the other the question arises which of the course be followed. It is ruled that the latter course be followed. That is सर्वस्य दक्षिणा be given. This ruling is of the nature of पर being preferred to पूर्व. In the present case उपसंहार is पर while उपक्रम is पूर्व. Hence उपसंहार be preferred to उपक्रम.

अध्वर्युं प्रस्तोता अन्वारभते प्रस्तोतारमुद्गाता उद्गातारं प्रतिहर्तेत्यादि-
क्रमेण अन्वारभ्य प्रसर्पतां मध्ये यदि कचिदुद्गातृप्रतिहर्त्रोः क्रमेण अन्वारम्भ
विच्छेदः तदा तन्निमित्तयोः प्रायश्चित्तयोः 'यदि उद्गाता अवच्छिद्येत्
अदक्षिणो यज्ञः सम्पाद्यः यदि प्रतिहर्ता अपच्छिद्येत् सर्वविदसं दद्यात् ।
अदक्षिणसर्वस्वदक्षिणादानरूपयोः विरुद्धयोः समुच्चित्यनुष्ठानाशक्तेः परस्य
पूर्वोपमर्देनैवोत्पत्ति नियमात् परनिमित्तमेव अनुष्ठेयमिति सिद्धान्तितम् ।

12) Quoting the उपसंहार प्राबल्यवादिन्'s view as stated above
Upakrama Parākrama argues that. In a sentence later portion
conveys its meaning connected with the meaning of the
earlier portion only. In the present case उपसंहार can convey
its meaning only as connected with the meaning of उपक्रम.
To achieve this position. लक्षणा has to be resorted to उपसंहार
only when there is a conflict between the two.

- i) एकस्मिन् वाक्ये पूर्वपूर्वभागार्थस्वार्थबोधकत्वस्यैव व्युत्पत्ति-
सिद्धतया तदनन्वितोपसंहारार्थं विषयज्ञानासम्भवात् ॥
- ii) उपक्रमोपसंहारयोरेकवाक्यतामनुसन्दधतां उपसंहारस्य लक्षणा-
कल्पनां विना मुख्यार्थं बोधासम्भवात् ।

13) Upasamhāra Vijaya points out that the
comprehencen of उपसंहार statement arises before its अन्वय
with उपक्रम statement. When it proceeds to get connected
with उपक्रम the conflict is realised. This necessitates लक्षणा
for उपक्रम statement.

- i) तदनन्वितोपसंहारजन्यमुख्यार्थगोचरज्ञानस्यैव परत्वेन उपक्रम-
बाधकत्वोपगमात् ।

- ii) उपक्रमैकवाक्यत्वानुसन्धानदशायां वा तदननुसन्धानदशायां वा उपक्रमार्थानन्वितोपसंहार गोचरज्ञानोत्पत्तौ बाधकाभावात् ।

14) In support of उपक्रमप्राबल्य two *adhikaraṇas* viz. वेदोपक्रमादिकरण and अश्वप्रतिग्रहेष्ट्यधिकरण are quoted.

Upasamhāra Vijaya points out that in वेदोपक्रमाधिकरण the statement in उपक्रम is preferred to that of उपसंहार. However, the ground for this preference is not उपक्रमप्राबल्य. There is अभ्यास i.e. frequent mention of a point. In the present case वेदधर्मत्व of उच्चैष्ठः etc. is frequently stated, the criterion of अभ्यास is superior to उपसंहार. Thus it is a case of preference of अभ्यास to that of उपसंहार but not that preference of उपक्रम to that of उपसंहार.

ननु एवं सति उपक्रमाधिकरण विरोध इति चेन्न । नहि तत्र उपक्रमानु-
रोधेन स्वराणां वेदधर्मत्वनिर्णयः । उपक्रमे वेदशब्दः त्रयो वेदाः अजायन्त
अग्नेः ऋग्वेदः वायोः यजुर्वेदः आदित्यात् सामवेदः इतभ्यस्तः अभ्यासश्च
उपसंहारात् प्रबलः ।

15) In अश्वप्रतिग्रहेष्ट्यधिकरण in उपक्रम it is stated that प्रजापति who had made अश्वदान should perform वारुणेष्टि. In the उपसंहार it is stated that he who received अश्वs has to perform this इष्टि.

- i) उपक्रमे अश्वदातुः प्रजापतेः वरुणग्रह निर्मोकहेतुत्वेन इष्टेः
प्रशंसावशात् अश्वदातुः इयमिष्टिः विधास्यते ।

- ii) दान एव प्रतिगृण्हाति शब्दः योजनीयः । प्रतिगृण्हातीति प्रतिग्रहकर्ता उच्यते । यः प्रतिग्रहहेतुभूतं दानमाचरति सोऽपि प्रतिग्रहकर्तेति व्यपदिश्यते ।

Upasamhāra Vijaya does not dispute the position of दातुः इष्टिकर्तृत्व but its ground is not its mention in उपक्रम but its being an अङ्गयाग. अङ्गयाग has to be performed by the same person who performs प्रधानयाग. Therefore this adhikaraṇa also does not support उपक्रमप्राबल्य.

नापि अश्वप्रतिग्रहेष्ट्यधिकरणविरोधः तत्रापि नोपक्रमानुसारेण दातु-रिष्टिरिति निर्णयः किन्तु कर्माङ्गत्ववशेन अङ्गप्रधानानामेकदेश कालकर्तृत्व-न्यायात् । यश्च क्रतोः कर्ता तेनैव इयमपि कर्तव्या इति सिद्धयति । क्रतोः कर्ता अश्वस्य दाता न प्रतिग्रहीता । तस्मात् कर्माङ्गत्ववशेन निर्णयः न तु उपक्रमानुसारेण ।

16) After discussing the problem of उपक्रमप्राबल्य or उपसंहारप्राबल्य with reference Pūrvamīmāṃsā adhikaraṇas Upakrama Parākrama discusses this problem with reference to some adhikaraṇa of Vedānta Sūtras such as तदन्तरप्रतिपत्त्यधिकरण, न संख्योपसङ्गहाधिकरण, पारिप्लवाधिकरण and दहराधिकरण.

In दहराधिकरण Upakrama Parākrama claims that the large number of attributes stated in उपक्रम establish परब्रह्मत्व of आकाश.

दहराधिकरणे दहराकाशस्य परब्रह्मता वाक्यशेषगतश्रुतिलिङ्गभूयस्त्वेन निर्णीता ।

But Upasamhāra Vijaya points out that वाक्यशेष-
प्रतिपादितानां लिङ्गानां बहुत्वेऽपि तेषां गुणत्वात् नोक्तन्यायेन आकाश-
शब्दार्थस्य उपास्यब्रह्मत्वनिर्णयः । किन्तु उपसंहारबलादेवेत्यकामेनापि
तत्प्राबल्यं वाच्यम् ।

17) The problem उपक्रमप्राबल्य or उपसंहार प्राबल्य was already discussed by Śrī Vyāsātīrtha in तर्कताण्डव and समन्वयाधिकरण of तात्पर्यचन्द्रिका. However, Appayya Dikṣita raised it again in his उपक्रमपराक्रम. He is well-versed in Pūrvamīmāṃsā, consequently he has quoted extensively from Pūrvamīmāṃsā adhikaraṇas. In this vast jungle of Pūrvamīmāṃsā, one is likely to miss the main issue. There is a lot of beating the bush also. However Śrī Vijayindra tīrtha skillfully separates the wade and focuses on the main issues. He reveals his deeper knowledge of Pūrvamīmāṃsā and out wits Appayya Dikṣita on crucial points.

Both extensively quote each other. It is a carefully recorded debate on this topic.

A study of these two texts will provide deeper insight into Pūrvamīmāṃsa.

Mahāmahopadhyaya

Prof. K.T. Pandurangi

Former Prof. of Sanskrit,

Bangalore University.

Hon. Director, Dvaita Vedanta

Foundation, Bangalore.

Śrī Vijayīndra tirtha's Upasamhāra Vijaya

-Vidyābhūṣaṇa Dr. B.N.K. Sharma

The name of Śrī Vijayīndra Tirtha (1539-95) stands for great intellectual vigor and independence of thought in the history of Post-Vyāsarāya polemics in Dvaita Literature. A scholar personally taught and trained by the great Vyāsarāya himself, Vijayīndra was in every sense of the term, a chip of the old block. Many and varied have been his contributions to Sanskrit literature, in the realms of religion and philosophy, no less than in those of Kāvya, Nāṭaka and Alamkāra. The versatility of his genius and equipment was something that had to be reckoned with, by his compeers and critics. Over 104 works, large and small, have been authentically ascribed to him. More than half of this number is happily traceable, or is known thro references, while a good many are preserved in manuscripts.

There is no doubt that his works had served a timely purpose in silencing the critics of Madhvasiddhānta, like the famous Appayya Dikṣita, Nṛsimhaśarma and Tātāchārya, who had found their tongues and their pens, after the demise of the great Vyāsarāya. But the non-publication of many of Vijayīndra's works, had given a handle to cheap critics, in modern times, to assert that they were of little or no merit, after all. (The late) Sri Dr. H.K. Vedavyasacharya and Sri Raja Gururajacharya, both closely connected with the Pontifical Successor of Śrī

Vijayindra, had conceived the happy idea of publishing all the available works of Vijayindra. They started the series with the "Bhedavidyāvilāsa" (1947) which is a close critique by Vijayindra of the Bhedādhikāra (Critique of Difference) of Nṛsimhasarma. A few other controversial works of Vijayindra were also subsequently published.

Now comes the present work "Upasamhāra Vijaya" a work on Pūrvamīmāṃsa technique, criticising the thesis of the interpretative ascendancy of the "Upakrama" (initial statement) in case of conflict, over the "upasamhāra" (concluding part), in a textual whole. This question is of vital importance in the scheme of textual interpretation of Veda and Vedānta. The followers of Śaṅkara have sponsored the superiority of the Upakrama over the Upasamhāra, claiming for it the august sanction of the Pūrvamīmāṃsa Śāstra itself. Śrī Madhva, has however, held in his writings that the seven Tātparyaliṅgas are to be viewed as possessing an ascending order of merit. He claims the authority of the Brahmatarka for his stand.

As Madhva's view was obviously at variance with the opinion of the Advaitic schoolmen who were supposed to follow faithfully the traditions of the Mīmāṃsakas (व्यवहारे भट्टनयः) it had to be vindicated sooner or later by the followers of Madhva, in the light of evidences accepted by both the parties. It was the great Vyāsarāya who took the bull by the horns for the first time, in his

Tātparya-Chandrika and Tarkatāṇḍava, wherein he had tried to demonstrate, in the light of accepted canons of Pūrvamīmāṃsa that the thesis of “Upasamhāra prābalya” (उपक्रमादिलिङ्गानां बलीयोद्युत्तरोत्तरम्) referred to by Madhva, was by no means a new fangled idea of his own; but that it had the clear sanction and support of the Pūrvamīmāṃsa Śāstra and its authentic expositors.

For the time being Vyāsarāya's treatment of the topic sufficed to silence the objections of critics. But after his demise, critics like Appayya Dikṣita reopened the issue. One of Appayya's works, the “Upakrama-Parakrama,” was a downright denunciation of Madhva's theory. The Dikṣita uses all sorts of arguments, including satire, to ridicule the thesis of Upasamhāraprābalya as a topsy-turvy process.

Śrī Vijayīndra Tirtha has given a dignified reply to the Dikṣita's criticisms, in the present work. His tone is elevated and the treatment of the subject, strictly objective. He never descends to personal invectives. The work shows Vijayīndra's depth of erudition in Pūrvamīmāṃsa and his great logical penetration and ready resourcefulness to meet his adversary on his own ground. Appayya's remarks and rejoinders are faithfully quoted and effectively met. The cogency of the arguments could naturally, be appreciated only by those who are well-posted with the Mīmāṃsā adhikaraṇas and the technicalities of their nyāyas and Viśayavākyas. The lay reader may find it difficult to “see the point” of these

abstruse and seemingly endless arguments and their niceties. Nevertheless, Vijayindra has tried to emphasise certain broad principles in support of Madhva's stand, which could be understood by all.

(1) The Upasamhāra stands in the relation of a "Vyākhyāna" (explanation), to the Upakrama which is to be viewed as the व्याख्येय (what is to be explained).

(2) व्याख्येयस्य निश्चितप्रामाण्यव्याख्यानसारेणैवार्थनिर्णयो युक्तः ॥ A text whose precise import is to be fixed, has naturally to be interpreted in consistency with that whose sense and validity are established (viz., the व्याख्यान).

(3) The part of the text that interprets an earlier part, in a given whole, is syntactically to be viewed as logically subsequent to the other (व्याख्यानस्य पश्चात्तनत्वनियमात्).

(4) The syntactic relation of व्याख्यानव्याख्येयभाव cannot be reversed at will. It must needs be based on a certain criterion. This criterion, in Vedic texts, says Vijayindra, must be the "Upakrama" which is prima facie "given" in traditional recitation : उपक्रम एव व्याख्येयत्वेन स्वीकार्यः । विहिताध्ययनदशायां तस्यैव नियमेन प्रथमोपस्थितत्वात् ॥

(5) The Vedic texts are not Pauruṣeya and cannot be deemed to have an intentional sequence of 'vyākhyāna' and 'vyākhyeya,' as in human utterances, the same principle of inner harmony that justifies the presence of

the imperative in Vedic injunctions, may be deemed to account for the natural order of व्याख्यानव्याख्येयभाव in their statements.

(6) Even in respect of non-Scriptural texts where the order of व्याख्यानव्याख्येयभाव is whimsical, there is such a thing as the “sense order” (arthakrama) which is more binding and has precedence over the word-order (pāthakrama), which would easily decide the nature of व्याख्यानव्याख्येयभाव in cases of doubt.

(7) The only difference between Vedic and secular texts is that while in the former the text order as given, is purely (अदृष्टार्थ), governed by ‘unseen merit’ in the latter it is optional, (aicchika). But this makes absolutely no difference to the principle of regulating the “vyākhyānavyākhyeyabhāva” and its implications.

(8) What is of doubtful import (सन्दिग्धार्थ) and “given” at first (नियमेन प्रथमोपस्थित) must thus be accepted as the “Vyākhyeya” (to be clarified) in the light of what follows. The “Upakrama” satisfies this criterion and so is to be invariably treated as the “vyākhyeya” (to be interpreted). There is clear possibility of सन्दिग्धार्थत्वं (room for doubt) about the precise import, in the case of terms like ‘वेद’ स्वां देवतां and इयेन in the texts that constitute the subject-matter of the Vedopakramadhi-karaṇa, Aśvapratigraheshtyadhikaraṇa, and Śyenādhi-jāraṇa respectively, in which the Upakramanyāya has been pressed into service, by the others.

II

Vijayindra shows that the counter thesis of "Upakramaprābalya" is really a shallow one, resting on the mere accident of "priority" of enunciation which is not necessarily a logical consideration. The contention that at the stage of the Upakrama, (when the eye does not meet the Upasamhāra) there is or can be no conflict with the Upasamhāra and that therefore, the Upakrama could be vested with precedence and primacy to the extent of imposing a secondary sense (लक्षणीकार्य) on the Upasamhāra, is to say the least, trivial. To vest the "Upakrama," simply because it is the "Upakrama" (and on no other criterion) with a primary sense (मुख्यार्थ) and apply a secondary sense (लक्षणा) to the Upasamhāra, in order to square it up with the Upakrama, does not rest on any valid material or logical grounds at all, and cannot therefore be taken seriously. The relation of व्याख्यानव्याख्येयभाव which the Dvaita thinkers have made out, on the other hand, between the Upasamhāra and the Upakrama (upon which they base their thesis of Upasamhāraprābalya) and the logical ascendancy of the "Vyākhyāna" over the "Vyākhyeya," are both substantial principles of thought and interpretation, which have a greater binding force and claim to our acceptance, in the solution of this question "Which is superior, 'Upakrama' or the Upasamhāra?" Vijayindra incidentally clarifies another point that what is meant by saying that the "Upasamhāra" overrides the "Upakrama," is that the

latter would be subjected to a slight depreciation of meaning : स्वार्थानाकाङ्क्षितमुख्यार्थादुपक्रमं प्रच्याव्य, तदाकाङ्क्षितार्थे तद्व्यवस्तापनरूपम् ॥ and not certainly an utter negation as in “Badha” (sublation). It is rightly pointed out by him that “Badha,” has been explained in various senses in the Pūrvamīmāṃsa Śāstra, consistent with the self-validity of the Veda.

III

The next and most important contribution made by Vijayīndra is to prick the bubble of “Upakramanyāya” having been applied at all, in respect of the well-known Adhikaraṇas of the Pūrvamīmāṃsa like (1) the Vedopakramādhikaraṇa (2) the Aśvapratigraheṣṭyadhikaraṇa etc. The discussion carried out by him here, should really be an eye-opener to many a Pūrvamīmāṃsaka and Advaitin who assume that it is on the strength of the Upakramaprābalyanyāya that the ruling has been given in these adhikaraṇas. Vijayīndra contends that there is no evidence in these two adhikaraṇas, of the Upakramanyāya, as such having been employed to arrive at a decision of the import. This contention is however likely to be misconstrued by many a so-called Mīmāṃsaka as being tantamount to a flouting of the received interpretation of these adhikaraṇas. But it is not so. Neither Vyāsarāya nor Vijayīndra, denies here that the net result of the two adhikaraṇas (वेदोपक्रमाधिकरण and अश्वप्रतिग्राहेष्टि) is that the

Introduction

“Upakrama” prevails over the “Upasamhāra,” in the finale. But what they insist upon, however, is that this conclusion, is reached, not on the ground of उपक्रमप्राबल्य as against उपसंहार, as such, as contended by the Advaitins and some Mimāmsakas (?); but on entirely different criteria (which have been clearly explained by Vijayindra, in the work under notice). The interesting fact is that the result (attained in the two adhikaraṇas in question) is the same; but the process by which it is reached, is not thro Upakramaparākrama! Vijayindra has argued this point with great force and a convincing array of reasons. He indicates the relevant “nyāyas” (other than Upakrama-prābalya) such as अभ्यास and कर्माङ्गत्व etc., which are applicable and are shown to have been applied, as a matter of fact in these cases. He also cites, following Vyāsarāya, the authoritative Mimāmsaka works like Tantraratna, Vārtika etc., and yājñika practice, in support of his exposition. He also shows, in passing, the limitations of Appayya’s knowledge of Yājñika-Ācāra and genuine Mimāmsa traditions. He also reinforces his position of “Upasamhāraprābalya” with reference to the अक्ताधिकरण, अपच्छेदाधिकरण etc. He concludes by pointing out that a blind acceptance and exaltation of the Upakrama as such over the Upasamhāra, in the absense of and without other logical criteria, would defeat and cut at the very root of all textual investigation (Vimarśa) : उपसंहारादुपक्रमस्य प्राबल्ये, सर्वत्राप्यापातप्रत्ययस्यैव प्राबल्यात् विमर्शवैयर्थ्यम् ॥

“First come first served” might be all right for gastronomical treats; but hardly a sane or sound principle to be followed in Vākyārtha Mīmāṃsa! Vijayindra carries on equally learned discussions on the other adhikaraṇas, like ज्योतिष्टोमाधिकरण, धागपशुन्याय etc., to reinforce his thesis that the Upasamhāra as “Vyākhyāna,” has regulating authority over the Upakrama viewed as “Vyākhyeya.” These recondite discussions could only be appreciated by a close acquaintance with the technicalities of the subject. The general trends of this important contribution of Vijayindra, set forth here, in this brief Introduction, would it is hoped, suffice to demonstrate the sweet reasonableness of Madhva’s thesis : उपक्रमादिलिङ्गानां बलीयो ह्युत्तरोत्तरम् ॥ which both Śrī Vyāsarāya and his eminent disciple Vijayindra have undertaken to establish with facts and figures, in the light of accepted texts and traditions and nyāyas of the Pūrvamīmāṃsakas and in which, any unprejudiced scholar will agree, they have succeeded.

I deem it a great privilege, in introducing, a great work of Śrī Vijayindra Tīrtha.

सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रश्रीविजयीन्द्रगुरो कृतेः ।

भावुकानां प्रसादार्थमुपोद्धातो मया कृतः ॥

सुहृदा गुरुराजेन प्रेर्यमाणेन सादरम् ।

अनया सेवया मह्यं विजयीन्द्रः प्रसीदतु ॥

ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧ್ಯದೀಪಿಕಾ

೧) ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಜಯೇಂದ್ರತೀರ್ಥರು ರಚಿಸಿದ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧ್ಯದೀಪಿಕಾ ಎಂಬ ಗ್ರಂಥವು ಪೂರ್ವಮೀಮಾಂಸಾ ದರ್ಶನದ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗ್ರಂಥವು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಜೈಮಿನೀ ಸೂತ್ರಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಶಬರಭಾಷ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ನಿರೂಪಣೆ ಇರುವುದು. ಗ್ರಂಥದ ಆರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಜೈಮಿನಿಸೂತ್ರಗಳ ೧೨ ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ, ೬೦ ಪಾದ ಮತ್ತು ೧೦೦೦ ಅಧಿಕರಣಗಳ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂತ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಅಧಿಕರಣಕ್ರಮಗಳ ಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ನಿರೂಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನೂ, ಕಾರಣವನ್ನೂ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದೊಂದೂ ವಿಷಯದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವನ್ನು ನಿರೂಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಂಗತಿಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆಯಾ ಅಧಿಕರಣಗಳ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದಮೇಲೆ ಅದಕ್ಕಿರುವ ಅಪವಾದಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಿರೋಧವು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದರ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪೂರ್ವಮೀಮಾಂಸಾಶಾಸ್ತ್ರದ ನಿರೂಪಣೆಯು ವಿಮರ್ಶಾತ್ಮಕವಾದ ನಿರೂಪಣೆಯಾಗಿದೆ.

೨) ಅಧ್ಯಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದ ವಿಷಯಗಳು

ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ ೧ ವಿಧಿ ಅರ್ಥವಾದ ಮಂತ್ರ ನಾಮಧೇಯರೂಪವಾದ ಸಮಗ್ರವೇದದ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣ್ಯ ನಿರೂಪಣೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ ೨ ಯಜತಿ, ದದಾತಿ, ಜುಹೋತಿ ಎಂಬ ಪದಗಳಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದ ಕರ್ಮಗಳ ಭೇದದ ನಿರೂಪಣೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ ೩ ಪ್ರಯಾಜಾದಿಗಳು, ದರ್ಶಪೂರ್ಣಮಾಸದ ಅಂಗ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಯಾದ ಅಂಗತ್ವದ ನಿರೂಪಣೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ ೪ ಗೋದೋಹನವು ಪುರುಷಾರ್ಥ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾದುದು. ಕೃತ್ವರ್ಥ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ, ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಕೃತ್ವರ್ಥ ಪುರುಷಾರ್ಥ ನಿರೂಪಣೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ ೫ ಕ್ರಮದ ನಿರೂಪಣೆ

ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ ೬ ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ನಿರೂಪಣೆ

ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ ೭ ಅತಿದೇಶದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ನಿರೂಪಣೆ

೧೫) ಪೂರ್ವಮೀಮಾಂಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವ ಅಧಿಕರಣಗಳ ಸಹಾಯದಿಂದ ಉಪಕ್ರಮ ಉಪಸಂಹಾರಗಳ ಪ್ರಾಬಲ್ಯ ದೌರ್ಬಲ್ಯಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ವೇದಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿಯ ಕೆಲವು ಅಧಿಕರಣಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ದಹರಾಧಿಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ರಹ್ಮನ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಶೇಷಣಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆಕಾಶಪದವು ಪರಬ್ರಹ್ಮವಾಚಕವು ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸಿದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಅಧಿಕರಣವು ಉಪಕ್ರಮ ಪ್ರಾಬಲ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಥಿಸುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಉಪಕ್ರಮ ಪರಾಕ್ರಮವು ಹೇಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಉಪಸಂಹಾರ ವಿಜಯವು ವಾಕ್ಯಶೇಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ ಬ್ರಹ್ಮನ ಧರ್ಮಗಳು ಅನೇಕವಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವು ಗುಣಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಉಪಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದ ಇವುಗಳಿಂದ ಉಪಾಸ್ಯಬ್ರಹ್ಮನ ನಿರ್ಣಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಉಪಸಂಹಾರವಾದ ವಾಕ್ಯದಿಂದಲೇ ನಿರ್ಣಯವಾಗುವುದು.

೧೬) ಶ್ರೀವ್ಯಾಸತೀರ್ಥರ ತರ್ಕತಾಂಡವದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಕ್ರಮಪರಾಕ್ರಮಭಂಗ ಎಂಬ ಶೀರ್ಷಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದ ಉಪಕ್ರಮ ದೌರ್ಬಲ್ಯದ ನಿರೂಪಣೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರರೂಪವಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಅಪ್ಪಯ್ಯ ದೀಕ್ಷಿತರು ಉಪಕ್ರಮ ಪರಾಕ್ರಮ ಎಂಬ ಗ್ರಂಥವನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿದರು. ಇವರ ವಾದದ ಕೊರತೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಜಯೇಂದ್ರತೀರ್ಥರು ಉಪಸಂಹಾರ ವಿಜಯವನ್ನು ಬರೆದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಪ್ಪಯ್ಯದೀಕ್ಷಿತರು ಪೂರ್ವಮೀಮಾಂಸಾ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಗಾಧ ಪಂಡಿತರಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಉಪಕ್ರಮ-ಪರಾಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಪೂರ್ವಮೀಮಾಂಸಾ ಅಧಿಕರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿ ಜಿಜ್ಞಾಸುಗಳ ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಲು ಮೀಮಾಂಸಾಶಾಸ್ತ್ರದ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಅರಣ್ಯವನ್ನೇ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಅರಣ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶಿಸಲು ಜಿಜ್ಞಾಸುಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಾಲುದಾರಿಯನ್ನು, ಮೀಮಾಂಸಾ-ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರದ ಅರಣ್ಯವನ್ನು ಆಳವಾಗಿ ಬಲ್ಲ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಜಯೇಂದ್ರತೀರ್ಥರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಎರಡೂ ಗ್ರಂಥಗಳು ವಿದ್ವತ್‌ವಿನೋದಗಳೂ ಆಗಿವೆ, ವಿದ್ವತ್‌ಬೋಧಕವೂ ಆಗಿವೆ.

विषयविवरणम्

Preface	iii
Introduction	v
Sri Vijayindra tirtha's Upasamhāra Vijaya	xxii
ಕನ್ನಡ ಪೀಠಿಕೆ	xxiii
न्यायाध्वदीपिका	1
उपक्रमपराक्रमः	97
उपसंहारविजयः	163
मीमांसकोक्तस्योपसंहारादुपक्रमप्राबल्यभङ्गः	242
मीमांसासारसङ्ग्रहः	269

विजयीन्द्रभिक्षुविरचिता

न्यायाध्वदीपिका

रक्षोनाथस्य वक्षोभुवि विपुलनखैर्वज्रकल्पैः कृतायां

रक्तस्रोतःसरस्यां प्रतिफलितमिदं स्वं वपुर्वीक्षमाणः ।

स्मृत्वांशं भार्गवाख्यं रघुवरमपि तं रावणं तत्प्रसक्त्या

चैवं रुष्टः प्रहृष्टः प्रदिशतु हृदि शं श्रीनृसिंहोऽनिशं नः ॥ १ ॥

उर्व्यां सत्कर्णतां यान्ति यदुणाकर्णने रताः ।

अर्णवं गुणरत्नानां पूर्णबोधं तमाश्रये ॥ २ ॥

यस्य वाक्कामधेनुर्नः कामितार्थान् प्रयच्छति ।

सेवे तं जययोगीन्द्रं कामबाणच्छिदं सदा ॥ ३ ॥

श्रीमन्मध्वमताब्धीन्दुं दुर्वादिफणिपक्षिणम् ।

ब्रह्मण्याख्यमुनेः शिष्यं व्यासदेशिकमाश्रये ॥ ४ ॥

मूर्खोऽपि वावदूकेन्द्रो जायते यदनुग्रहात् ।

श्रीसुरेन्द्रगुरोस्तस्य पादौ नत्वा गिरं भजे ॥ ५ ॥

न्यायाध्वगामिनामध्वदर्शनाद्गतिसिद्धये ।

तन्यते विजयीन्द्रेण तन्वी न्यायाध्वदीपिका ॥ ६ ॥

ग्रन्थग्रन्थिविमोकस्य नेशते येऽल्पबुद्धयः ।

तेषां कृते जयीन्द्रस्य कृतिरेषा प्रवर्तते ॥ ७ ॥

नित्यं ये पदवाक्यमानसरणीसंशीलनालङ्कृता-

स्तेषामेव करोति या प्रतिपदं सन्तोषमाकर्णनात् ।

या चानेकविनेयषट्पदततेः संफुल्लमल्ली सदा

सैषा वाग्विजयीन्द्रसंयमिमणेन्यायाध्वगैः सेव्यताम् ॥ ८ ॥

यद्यपि शास्त्रदीपिकादिरूपा दीपिका न्यायाध्वगामिनां गतिसिद्धये तदध्व दर्शनसाधनरूपा पूर्वमेव प्रवृत्ताऽस्ति, तथाऽपि न तथा बालाबालसाधारणं गतिसाधनदर्शनं सिद्धयति; शास्त्रदीपिकादेः प्रौढप्रकाशत्वेन बालदृष्ट्यभि- भावकत्वात् । न हि दृष्ट्यभिभवे तत्पद्धतिदर्शनं सम्भवत् दृष्टचरम् । अत एव प्रौढसौरालोकाभिभूतदृष्टयो लोकाः सन्निकृष्टानपि पदार्थानपश्यन्तो दृश्यन्ते, तत एव प्रतिरुद्धगतयोऽपि । तस्माद्बालाबालसाधारणं दृष्ट्यनभि- भवेन न्यायाध्वदर्शनेन गतिसिद्ध्यर्थं तन्त्यायाध्वदीपिकानिष्पादनाय अय- मस्मदीयो यत्नः न विफलः ।

“लोके ह्यसङ्गतानर्थान् वक्ताऽश्रद्धेयवागिति ।

दर्शनात् सङ्गतानर्थान् वक्ष्ये श्रद्धेयतासये ॥”

तथा हि— परस्परसङ्गता एव न्यायाः अध्वगतये विज्ञातव्यार्थज्ञानाय तत्फललाभाय च उपयुज्यन्ते, नान्यथा ।

सङ्गतयश्च अनेकविधाः सम्भवन्ति । तत्र प्रथममपेक्षिताः सङ्गतयः तिस्रः—शास्त्रसङ्गतिः, अध्यायसङ्गतिः, पादसङ्गतिश्चेति । ताश्च शास्त्राध्याय पादानां च त्रयाणां असाधारणे विषये ज्ञाते सति स्वयमेव ऊहितुं शक्यन्त इति शास्त्रस्य अध्यायानां पादानां च तावत् असाधारणो विषयः सामान्यतो ज्ञाप्यते । शास्त्रं नाम तदिह विवक्षितं यत् ‘अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा’ इत्यादि ‘अन्वाहार्ये च दर्शनात्’ इत्यन्तं द्वादशाध्यायोपेतं षष्टिपादयुक्तं न्याय- निबन्धनात्मकसूत्रसन्दर्भरूपम् । तस्य कृत्स्नस्य शास्त्रस्य विषयो धर्म एव ।

अत एव ‘अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा’ इति शास्त्रादिमसूत्रेणोपक्रमरूपेण जिज्ञास्यत्वेन संप्रतिज्ञातः, ‘चोदनालक्षणोऽर्थो धर्मः’ इति लक्षितः, ‘तस्य निमित्तपरीष्टिः’ इत्यादिना परीक्षितश्च । अध्यायानां च द्वादशानां प्रमाणा- दयः प्रसङ्गान्ता द्वादशपदार्थाः असाधारणाः विषयाः ।

तथा हि—

तत्र प्रथमेऽध्याये विध्यर्थवादमन्त्रनामधेयात्मकस्य कृत्स्नस्य वेदस्य प्रामाण्यं निरूपितं इति तस्याध्यायस्य कृत्स्नवेदप्रामाण्यरूपोऽर्थोऽसाधारणो विषयः ।

द्वितीयाध्याये यजति ददाति जुहोति कर्मणां भेदो निरूपित इति तद्भेदरूपोऽर्थस्तस्यासाधारणो विषयः ।

तृतीयेऽध्याये प्रयाजादीनां दर्शपूर्णमासार्थत्वेन तच्छेषत्वं निरूपितमिति तद्रूपोऽर्थः तस्यासाधारणो विषयः ।

चतुर्थे गोदोहनस्य पुरुषार्थप्रयुक्त्या अनुष्ठानं न तु क्रत्वर्थप्रयुक्त्या इत्येवमादयो निरूपिता इति तस्य ते असाधारणविषयाः ।

पञ्चमे क्रमनियतिविधेयत्वादयः तथा इति ते तस्यासाधारणा विषयाः ।

षष्ठे कर्तुः अधिकारः न अन्धादेः इत्यादयो निरूपिता इति ते तस्य तथा ।

सप्तमे समानमितरच्छेयेनेत्येवमादिप्रत्यक्षवचनेन अग्निहोत्रादिनाम्ना अनुमितिवचनेन सामान्यतोऽतिदेशो निरूपित इति तस्य सोऽसाधारणो विषयः ।

अष्टमे ‘सौर्यं चरुं निर्वपेत्’ इत्यत्र निर्वापस्तद्धितेन देवतानिर्देशः,